



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,071	03/10/2004	Richard L. Sutherland	SAIC0006-CON1	2666
27510 7590 11/01/2007 KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP 607 14TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20071030

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief 08/13/2007 has been read, entered and considered.

Martin J. Angebranndt
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1795

SAIC0006-CON1
Serial No. 10/796,071

1

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 13 2007

In re Patent Application of

Richard L. Suther and, et al.

Art Unit: 1756

Serial No. 10/796,071

Examiner: ANGEBRANDT, M.

Filed: March 10, 2004

For: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR REPLICATING VOLUME HOLOGRAMS

REPLY BRIEF

FILED BY FACSIMILE - 571-273-8300

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

OK to
Enter
10/30/07

This is a Reply Brief filed in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 and in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed June 22, 2007.

The undersigned responds to the arguments beginning on page 15 of the Examiner's Answer under the section (10) Response to Argument as all previous pages contain duplicative rejections and arguments. In response to (10)A): The Office admits that "none of the references cited teaches using an electrically switchable hologram as a master in a contact duplication process," stating, "[t]he examiner agrees and addresses these criteria in a point by point basis." Accordingly, there is admittedly a limitation missing from the cited references, and as such the Office has not established a *prima face* case of unpatentability under 35 USC §103.

The remaining arguments by the Office are both moot in view of the admission above and repetitive and have been addressed numerous times by the undersigned. As stated by the Office the arguments "will not be repeated needlessly."

US2000 10324182.1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY